

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,022,531 issued to Horino et al (“Horino”). Horino teaches a bundle processing apparatus with pack counting capabilities. Horino in no way discloses a device, or a method, for processing substitute currency media. Additionally, several limitations of the pending claims are neither taught nor suggested by Horino.

Independent claim 1 of the pending application recites “transporting each of the documents, one at a time, past a detector” and “detecting the document-identifier of each substitute currency medium.” The documents processed by the device of claim 1 are fed “one at a time” through the device, thus the documents are not bound. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131.

Horino discloses a bundle processing device that receives a bundle of currency bills comprising a number of packs. Each of the packs contains a number of currency bills. Col. 2, ll. 56-60; Col. 3, ll. 8-15. Horino teaches that an entire *bundle* of documents is moved through the device at one time. Col. 3, ll. 16-21. The Horino device has a pack counting section to “count the number of packs t, which are sealed by small bands, constituting the bundle T.” Col. 3, ll. 30-35. Horino further discloses a “denomination detection section” that takes “[a]n image of the bundle T” using “a scanning camera 232 as shown in FIG. 6.” Col. 3, ll. 61-66. FIGS. 5 and 6 of Horino also clearly depict an intact bundle T being evaluated, not individual documents. Additionally, throughout the Horino disclosure, the bundle T is being evaluated, not individual documents that make up the bundle. *See*, Col. 3, ll. 40-44; Col. 3, l. 60 – Col. 4, l. 2; Col. 7, ll. 10-26. Horino, thus discloses a device that transports a bundle of bills T wrapped in a band J through the device. *See*, FIGS. 1, 5, and 8. Thus, the device of Horino would accept a bundle of documents where only the first or last document of the bundle was a valid document, even if all of the other documents within

the stack were blank pieces of paper. Horino thus is directed to an entirely different concept than the present application.

Horino does not disclose “transporting each of the documents, one at a time, past a detector” and “detecting the document-identifier of each substitute currency medium.” Rather, as previously described Horino only transports bundles of documents. There is no teaching whatsoever within Horino of the transportation of single documents. Thus, Horino fails to teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, and does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 13 of the present application recites “a transport mechanism adapted to transport the documents, one at a time, from the input receptacle to the at least one output receptacle along a transport path” and “an evaluation unit comprising at least one detector disposed along the transport path between the input receptacle and the output receptacle, the at least one detector being capable of detecting the document-identifier for each document.” As the documents of claim 13 are transported “one at a time,” the documents are not bound. As previously discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Horino discloses transporting *bundles* of documents, not transporting individual documents “one at a time.” The device described in Horino is not indicated to transport documents one at a time. Horino only transports *bundled* stacks of documents. As Horino transports bundles, Horino does not disclose “detecting the document-identifier for each document” as required by claim 13. Therefore, Horino fails to teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 13, and fails to anticipate claim 13.

Independent claim 28 of the present application recites several limitations, among them “transporting each of the documents, one document at a time, past a detector in said document processing device” and “detecting the document-identifier for each substitute currency medium.” As the documents of claim 28 are transported “one at a time,” therefore the documents are not bound. As previously described, Horino does not teach or suggest either of the above recited limitations, but rather transports entire *bundles* of documents and can only detect a single document of the bundle. Thus, the device of Horino is incapable of “transporting each of the documents, one document at a time, past a detector.” Consequently, Horino fails to teach or disclose at least these limitations of claim 28, and fails to anticipate claim 28.

Independent claim 37 recites “a transport mechanism adapted to transport the documents, one at a time, from the input receptacle to the at least one output receptacle along a transport path” and “an evaluation unit including at least one detector disposed along the transport path between the input receptacle and the at least one output receptacle, the at least one detector being capable of evaluating documents and detecting the document-identifier for each substitute currency medium.” As the documents of claim 37 are transported “one at a time,” therefore the documents are not bound as they move through the device. As mentioned previously, Horino only discloses transporting and evaluating wrapped *bundles* of documents. Hence, Horino fails to teach or disclose all of the limitations of claim 37, and fails to anticipate claim 37.

Claims 2-12, 14-27, 29-36, and 38-49 are dependent claims that depend from at least one of the independent claims previously discussed. As none of the independent claims are anticipated by Horino for the reasons given above, none of the dependent claims are anticipated by Horino for at least those same reasons.

Information Disclosure Statement Submitted July 14, 2005

Applicants note that the Foreign Patent Documents contained on the Form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement dated July 14, 2005 have not been considered by the Examiner as the Examiner stated that copies of the documents were not made available. Applicants respectfully note that in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted concurrently with the Form PTO-1449 the Applicant noted that the foreign references cited are contained within the Cummins-Allison Library located in the Knox Building at 3B29 (3rd Quarter; Room 29), and thus no copies were enclosed. The Cummins-Allison library was created in cooperation with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) to reduce the amount of papers submitted with each IDS, as the references contained within the Cummins-Allison Library are submitted on a regular basis to the PTO. Any questions regarding the Cummins-Allison Library, the applicants respectfully request that the PTO Examiner contact one of the following PTO Examiners or the undersigned:

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Primary Library Coordinator: Mark Beauchaine | Tel.: (571) 272-6934 |
| Secondary Library Coordinator: Jeff Shapiro: | Tel: (571) 272-6943 |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner: Don Walsh | Tel: (571) 272-6944 |

Additionally, for the Examiners convenience, a CD containing electronic copies of the foreign references has been enclosed with this amendment. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the foreign references cited that are contained in the Cummins-Allison Library and initial the Form PTO-1449 indicating that the references have been considered.

Conclusion

It is Applicants' belief that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, and action towards that effect is respectfully requested. No fee is believed presently due with this paper. Should any additional fees be required (except for payment of the issue fee), the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from Jenkins & Gilchrist, P.C. Deposit Account No. 10-0447, Order No. 47171-00413USPT.

If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number indicated.

Dated: February 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Anderson

Registration No.: 54,656

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

225 W. Washington, Ste. 2600

Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418

(312) 425-3900

Attorneys For Applicant